# Town Board Meeting August 20, 2015 7:00 p.m.

**Present:** Supervisor Sennett, Councilor Greenfield, Councilor Murray, Councilor Brace, Councilor Howard, Town Attorney Taylor.

**Also Present:** Julie Stenger, Bridgett Winkelman, Allan Wellington, Jason Gabak (Skaneateles Press), Jim Lanning, Pete Buehler, Dana Pickering.

#### **Department Reports**

Highway, Water, Transfer Station: Allan Wellington updated the Town Board on the Fennell Street Bridge replacement while pictures were being shown of the progress. He said the bridge has been dismantled and the concrete forms and re-rod installed for the poured foundations. All concrete work should be finished by August 24<sup>th</sup>. In the Highway Department they also cleaned up two trees that were taken down on Milford Drive. In the Water Department they repaired lawns from water main breaks, repaired a broken and leaking hydrant. At the Transfer Station Clifton Recycling started to haul away the log pile. They made repairs to the dump truck and skid steer and turned away three cars from entering that were not town residents.

Parks Department: Supervisor Sennett reported that Sue Murphy was on vacation yet had reached out to Emerson Park and was able to get an additional lifeguard for the waterfront after Emerson Park closes on August 23<sup>rd</sup>. The Town is hoping to keep the waterfront open as long as possible. Supervisor Sennett said that the very successful PlayDay program had their final day on August 14<sup>th</sup>. She also reported that the Parks Department was finishing up work on the Charlie Major Nature Trail where they repaired one bridge and spread a layer of stone dust along the trail.

**Budget**: Bridgett Winkelman reported that she had submitted the July Supervisor's Report and Fiscal Summary report to the Town Board. She is working with Department Heads on their 2016 budgets.

**Fire Department Report:** Dana Pickering reported on the calls, drills and training for the Skaneateles Fire Department for the month of July. During the month they had 17 fire calls, 8 rescue calls, 1 water rescue, 10 assists to SAVES and 5 mutual aids. They had 4 drills for July and have 4 trainings scheduled in August. In August they have 5 meetings scheduled of which two are for organizing the Labor Day field days. Field Days are Saturday, September 5th and Sunday September 6<sup>th</sup> with the parade at 4 p.m. and fireworks at 10 p.m.

#### Resolution #15-123

**Minutes of August 6, 2015:** Supervisor Sennett complimented Janet Aaron on the minutes for the detail she provided on the SEQR review for the Comprehensive Plan. On a motion of Councilor Howard, seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the minutes of August 6<sup>th</sup> were accepted as presented.

**SEQR Determination - Comprehensive Plan:** Attorney Taylor said that during the work session the Town Board reviewed Part 1 and Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form. John Camp, Engineer reviewed the questions that the Town Board had on #5 Impact on Flooding, #6 Impact on Air, #8 Impact on Agricultural Resources and #14 Impact on Energy. Mr. Camp found that in his opinion there would be no environmental impact in these areas.

Attorney Taylor read the 18 questions on Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form with the Town Clerk polling the Board on each question.

#### Resolution #15-124

1. **Impact on Land:** The proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-125

2. **Impact on Geological Factors**: The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-126

3. **Impacts on Surface Water:** The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds, lakes).

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-127

4. **Impact on groundwater:** The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No

Councilor Murray No Supervisor Sennett No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-128

5. **Impact on Flooding:** The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding.

Councilor HowardNoCouncilor BraceNoCouncilor GreenfieldNoCouncilor MurrayNoSupervisor SennettNo

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-129

6. **Impacts on Air:** The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. Councilor Brace said she did not know of anything in the Plan. Supervisor Sennett said she can't even imagine that this applies.

Councilor HowardNoCouncilor BraceNoCouncilor GreenfieldNoCouncilor MurrayNoSupervisor SennettNo

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-130

7. **Impacts on Plants and Animals:** The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna.

Councilor HowardNoCouncilor BraceNoCouncilor GreenfieldNoCouncilor MurrayNoSupervisor SennettNo

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-131

8. **Impacts on Agricultural Resources:** The proposed action may impact agricultural resources.

Councilor Howard No
Councilor Brace No
Councilor Greenfield No
Councilor Murray No
Supervisor Sennett No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-132

9. **Impact on Aesthetic Resources:** The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-133

10. **Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources**: The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

# Resolution #15-134

11. **Impact on Open Space and Recreation:** The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-135

12. **Impact on Critical Environmental Areas:** The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA).

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-136

13. **Impact on Transportation:** The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems.

Councilor Howard No

Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-137

14. **Impact on Energy:** The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-138

15. **Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light:** The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

# Resolution #15-139

16. **Impact on Human Health:** The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

# Resolution #15-140

17. **Consistency with Community Plan:** The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

#### Resolution #15-141

# 18. **Consistency with Community Character:** The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.

Councilor Howard	No
Councilor Brace	No
Councilor Greenfield	No
Councilor Murray	No
Supervisor Sennett	No

Carried 5-0

Attorney Taylor stated that the Town Board has studied the issues and has had time to review the proposed resolution regarding the determination of environmental significance under SEQR. He advised the Town Board that they could waive the reading of the resolution as it would be part of record.

#### Resolution #15-142

On a motion of Councilor Howard, seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board, based on the foregoing, and pursuant to SEQR's Regulations for determining the significance of an action, 6 NYCRR §617.7, the Proposed Action, a Type I action under SEQR's Regulations will have no significant adverse environmental impacts and, therefore, the Town Board hereby issues a Negative Declaration.

# [Resolution Attached]

#### Resolution #15-143

**Resolution Adopting Comprehensive Plan:** Attorney Taylor stated that the Town Board has had before them the draft Resolution for the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan which outlines the history, recognizes that the Town Board as Lead Agency and that the Town Board has issued a Negative Declaration under SEQR. This now allows the Town Board to consider adopting the Comprehensive Plan and sets 10 years as a maximum interval for which the proposed Comprehensive Plan shall be reviewed.

Councilor Brace said that the public submitted a number of comments which the Board is still reviewing as they move forward with implementing the Comprehensive Plan and reviewing the zoning. She said that the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan has been recommended by the Town and Village Planning and Zoning Boards and Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency (SOCPA). She said it is the universal opinion that the Town and Village are on the right path.

Councilor Murray said she wanted to be sure before adopting the Comprehensive Plan that the Town Board will not have to go back to amend the Plan for the comments that were received at the public hearing. She said she is concerned that the comments were addressed. She said she knows many of the comments would be reviewed for the zoning updates, she did not feel that all comments pertained to zoning. She does not want to have to change the Comprehensive Plan soon after it is adopted.

Supervisor Sennett said that it is possible that once the zoning is reviewed the Town Board may find a need for an amendment within the next year or two.

Councilor Brace said that the Open Space Plan will be an attachment to the Comprehensive Plan once a new one is adopted.

Supervisor Sennett said that the vision of the Comprehensive Plan is a good one. She said the SEQR resolution is a reminder on what a thorough job was done on this Plan and how strong it is. She doesn't think it is possible that there won't be amendments to the Plan which will require going through the legislative process. She said all comments and letters have been documented and she believes all concerns have been addressed.

Councilor Brace said that all comments and documents will be forwarded to the Town's zoning consultant for his or her recommendations.

On a motion of Councilor Brace, seconded by Councilor Howard and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board, the 2015 Comprehensive Plan was adopted.

Supervisor Sennett said that the SEQR resolution reminds the Board on each statement just how great this document is. She expressed thanks to all the people who have contributed over the years.

Councilor Howard said that she seconded the thanks to all volunteers. She personally witnessed week after week the devotion, energy and care given to produce this document. She said there is a depth of gratitude to many people for their many years of service to the community.

Councilor Brace said this is a milestone. The Town was very lucky to have professionals volunteer so many hours where most communities have to pay for this type of professional service. She is very grateful to the many people who contributed to the Plan.

#### Resolution #15-144

Town of Sennett Request for Extension of Water District #7: Supervisor Sennett said that the Town was in receipt of a request from Tom Gray, Sennett Town Supervisor on behalf of the Sennett Board and their Water Department to expand Water District #7 on Depot Road to include Donald Peters Farm.

Councilor Greenfield said that the additional use of water by the Peters Farm will actually help the Town's water district #1 due to the loss of commercial customers such as Empire Cheese in Hart Lot, Madison Filter and Welch Allyn on Jordan Road. The water has to be regularly flushed out of hydrants to prevent it from becoming stagnant. The use of water by the Peters Farm will benefit the district by their water use. He said the Town of Sennett has to flush half of the water that they use in order to maintain the quality of the water. He said that the Department of Health agrees that this would help the overall water quality and the City of Syracuse has verbally stated that they would agree to this extension of the water district. The Town would need to refer this to the Village of Skaneateles for their approval.

Councilor Howard said that this is an example of how municipalities help each other through a cooperative agreement.

On a motion of Councilor Greenfield, seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board, Supervisor Sennett was authorized to submit a letter to the Village of Skaneateles requesting that they approve the extension of Water District #7 in the Town of Sennett to service water to the Donald Peters Farm.

#### Resolution #15-145

**Schedule Budget Work Sessions:** On a motion of Supervisor Sennett, seconded by Councilor Howard and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the following work sessions were scheduled to begin review of the 2016 Town Budget:

All budget work sessions will be from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. and are open to the public.

Thursday, September 10<sup>th</sup>; Monday, September 14<sup>th</sup>; Monday, September 21<sup>st</sup>; Thursday, September 24<sup>th</sup>; Monday, September 28<sup>th</sup>.

#### Resolution #15-146

Schedule October 5, 2015 Hamlet Meeting Location: The Town Board agreed to hold their next Hamlet Meeting at 5:30 p.m. on October 5, 2015 at the Pavilion at the Conservation Area. \*\*After the meeting it was decided due to the lateness in the year that it may get dark too early in order to have the meeting at the Conservation Area. Ken and Joan Scott of 4874 Foster Road agreed to let the Town Board hold their meeting in their barn. The new time will be 7 p.m. on October 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### Resolution #15-147

**Authorization to Hire Neil Boedicker:** On a motion of Supervisor Sennett seconded by Councilor Brace and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board Neil Boedicker was authorized to be hired as a seasonal lifeguard effective immediately.

#### Announcements/Correspondence/Updates

- ${}^{\bullet}$ Paper Shredding at Transfer Station 9-noon Oct  $3^{rd}$  Only Town Residents with a valid Transfer Station Permit
- "Stella Maris Correspondence: Supervisor Sennett reported that the Town had written to Pioneer Management requesting a postponement of the August 15<sup>th</sup> deadline to receive bids. The Town received a reply on August 13<sup>th</sup> stating that at this point in the process of selling the Stella Maris Retreat they could not extend the deadline for offers beyond August 15<sup>th</sup>.

Councilor Murray said she talked with Martha Frey Congregational Facilities Director at Sisters of St. Francis who said they would love to see the Town obtain the property and encouraged the Town to continue looking for grants or donors.

\*West Lake Road Properties Sewer District Correspondence: Supervisor Sennett referred to a letter received from Robert Smith of Costello, Cooney & Fearon regarding the formation of a sewer district in the Town of Skaneateles for the West Lake Road properties on behalf of their

client LakeLawn Properties LLC. She said this has been referred to Shannon Harty and John Camp, Town Engineer with C & S Companies.

Attorney Taylor said he has been playing phone tag with attorney John Langey from the same law firm as Robert Smith. All the properties that the City of Syracuse and Village of Skaneateles originally identified and are currently served by the City of Syracuse and billed through the Village of Skaneateles are not included in Mr. Smith's letter. He will continue to follow up on this matter.

- \*\*CEC Energy Correspondence: Supervisor Sennett reported on a letter received from CEC energy asking the Town to consider looking at the feasibility of renewable energy for the municipality. The Town Board agreed to refer this to the Engineering Committee.
- \*Dower/Mirbeau Annexation Petition Correspondence: Supervisor Sennett referred to a letter received from attorney Kathleen Bennett from Bond, Schoeneck & King regarding the withdrawal of potential changes to Mirbeau Inn & Spa. The letter stated that since the submission of the EAF for the potential changes to the existing Mirbeau facility, the partners of Mirbeau of Skaneateles, LP no longer plan to pursue the potential changes to the existing Mirbeau facility as identified in the EAF. Accordingly, the potential changes and the EAF submitted in connection therewith are withdrawn. SEQR is still being reviewed by the Town Board.
- "Update on Town Hall Co-Location: Supervisor Sennett said that the preliminary floor plans have been submitted to the Town Board and Department Heads. She is starting to receive feedback. She said that thanks to Judge Jim Murphy, his staff was able to review the plans for court compliance issues.

Councilor Brace said this is an opportunity for the court to be able to access the booking area of the police department making it safer when offenders are being transported. She hopes that everyone gives feedback to the draft floor plan.

- New Interview date For Respondents to RFQ Zoning Audit beginning 5 p.m. 9/3/15
  Local Agriculture & Land Use leadership Institute Supervisor Sennett said this is being offered by SOCPA and is a 5-day course. Councilor Howard said she would be interested in attending as it relates to the Open Space Committee.
- \*Labor Day Parade: The Town Board agreed that they would be participating at the parade. Supervisor Sennett reminded the Board that at 9:30 a.m. on Sunday, September 6<sup>th</sup> the Town Board is invited to attend the review of the Fire Department.
- $^{\bullet}$ Alan Dolmatch Letter Re: Austin Pavilion: Supervisor Sennett said that Alan Dolmatch submitted a letter suggesting that the Town Board consider using Austin Pavilion as the location for the Town Hall. Supervisor Sennett said that a committee has been formed to look into the different options for the Pavilion but made clear that the Town does not own the Pavilion.

#### Resolution #15-148

**Budget Amendments/Adjustments:** On a motion of Councilor Greenfield, seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board the following budget amendments were approved.

# General Fund

\$3,000.00	Increase	013554.01.004.58	Assessment C/E - Legal
\$3,000.00	Decrease	014204.01.004.00	Attorney – C/E
Cost associat	ted with review	wand settlement of cha	llenged assessments.

\$ 6,000.00	Increase	071104.01.004.52	Summer Parks – C/E – Supplies
\$ 6,000.00	Decrease	071104.01.004.51	Summer Parks – C/E – Fields
Additional c	osts for supplie	es	

# Highway Townwide

\$ 75.00	Increase	090458.03.008.00	Life Insurance
\$ 75.00	Decrease	090898.03.008.00	Other Employee Benefits
Additional	Personnel inclu	ded in benefit package	

#### Resolution #15-149

**Abstract #15-16:** Councilor Greenfield made a motion seconded by Councilor Murray and with unanimous (5-0) affirmation of the Town Board voucher # 15-0975 to voucher # 15-1073 were approved from the following funds:

General Fund:	\$62,070.02	Part Town:	\$2,416.39
Highway:	\$12,274.28	Highway P/T:	\$2,550.07
Lighting:	\$ 1,116.46	Water:	\$2,921.23
Sewer #6:	\$ 38.24	T & A:	\$3,518.03

Total: \$86,904.72

# Resolution #15-150

Attorney Advice: On a motion of Supervisor Sennett, seconded by Councilor Howard to adjourn to Attorney Advice at 7:55 p.m.

Meeting returned to open session and adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\* (Jakou

anet L. Aaron Town Clerk

#### RESOLUTION

# TOWN OF SKANEATELES ADOPTION OF SKANEATELES, NEW YORK JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles (the "Town Board") and the Village Board of the Town of Skaneateles (the "Village Board") appointed the Skaneateles Comprehensive Plan Special Board (the "CPSB") to prepare a proposed joint comprehensive plan for the Town of Skaneateles and the Village of Skaneateles, pursuant NY Town Law ("NY Town Law") § 272-a(4) and NY Village Law ("NY Village Law") § 7-722(4); and

WHEREAS, the CPSB recommended to the Town Board and the Village Board a proposed comprehensive plan, titled "Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015" (the "Proposed Comprehensive Plan") on May 4th, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board formally introduced the Proposed Comprehensive Plan on May 7, 2015 and the Village Board formally introduced the Proposed Comprehensive Plan on June 11, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and the Village Board made the Proposed Comprehensive Plan available for public review at each entity's clerk's office and on each entity's website; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board referred the Proposed Comprehensive Plan to the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board (the "Town Planning Board") and the Town of Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals (the "Town Zoning Board") for review and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board referred the Proposed Comprehensive Plan to the Village of Skaneateles Planning Board (the "Village Planning Board") and the Village of Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals (the "Village Zoning Board") for review and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Town Planning Board and the Town Zoning Board both recommended that the Town Board adopt the Proposed Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and the Village Board received, and duly considered, comments and recommendations from the Town Planning Board, the Town Zoning Board, the Village Planning Board, and the Village Zoning Board; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with NY General Municipal Law § 239-m, the Town Board referred the Proposed Comprehensive Plan to the Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency ("SOCPA") for its review under said statute; and

WHEREAS, SOCPA approved the Town Board and the Village Board's adoption of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan and provided the following comments: "[SOCPA] commends the Town and Village for updating the Joint Comprehensive Plan, especially for its emphasis on the protection of rural land and open space, the promotion of smartgrowth principles, and the adoption of transect zones. [SOCPA] encourages a continued focus on infrastructure strategies and revisions to existing zoning and subdivision ordinances, in order to further the Town and Village goals to preserve natural resources and to support traditional neighborhood development;" and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NY Town Law § 272-a(6)(c) and NY Village Law § 21-2102, the Town Board and the Village Board held a joint public hearing on July 13, 2015 and duly considered the comments received during said hearing; and

WHEREAS, with regard to the NY State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"): (1) the "action," as defined under SEQR, is the Town Board and the Village Board's adoption of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan (the "Proposed Action"); (2) the Town Board and the Village Board each resolved that the Town Board would serve as Lead Agency with regard to the Proposed Action; and (3) the Town Board duly completed its environmental review under SEQR and issued a negative declaration for which the Town Board's written reasoned elaboration is contained in the Town Board's "Resolution Regarding Determination of Environmental Significance under SEQR for the Adoption of the Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015" dated and duly adopted on August 20, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and the Village Board desire to set the maximum intervals at which the Proposed Comprehensive Plan shall be reviewed, pursuant to NY Town Law § 272-a(10) and NY Village Law § 7-222(10); and

WHEREAS, the Town Board desires to adopt the Proposed Comprehensive Plan,

NOW, THEREFORE, the Town Board:

**RESOLVES** that, pursuant to NY Town Law § 272-a(7), the **Skaneateles**, **New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015** is hereby adopted; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, pursuant to NY Town Law § 272-a(11): (1) all future Town of Skaneateles land use regulations shall be in accordance with the Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015; and (2) all plans for capital projects of

another governmental agency on land included in the Town of Skaneateles shall take the **Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015** into consideration; and

**FURTHER RESOLVES**, pursuant to NY Town Law § 272-a(10), the maximum intervals at which the **Skaneateles**, **New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015** shall be reviewed is 10 years; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, pursuant to NY Town Law § 272-a(12), the Town of Skaneateles Clerk shall filed a copy of the Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015 in: (1) the office of the Town of Skaneateles Clerk; and (2) the office of the Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency.

#### CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that at a meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles held at the Skaneateles Town Hall, located at 24 Jordan Street in the Town of Skaneateles, County of Onondaga, and State of New York on the 20th day of August, 2015, the foregoing Resolution, the Resolution Regarding Determination of Environmental Significance under SEQR for the Adoption of the Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015, was duly moved by Councilor Brace and seconded by Councilor Howard, a quorum of five members of the five-member Town Board being present, and each voted on the Resolution as follows:

Supervisor Mary Sennett	Yes
Councilor Connie Brace	Yes
Councilor Claire Howard	Yes
Councilor Jim Greenfield	Yes
Councilor Nancy Murray	Yes

The Resolution was, therefore, duly adopted.

Dated: August 21, 2015

Janet L. Aaron, Town Clerk, Town of Skaneateles

# RESOLUTION REGARDING DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE UNDER SEQR FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE SKANEATELES, NEW YORK JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2015

#### NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR TYPE ONE ACTION

WHEREAS, the Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles (the "Town Board") and the Village Board of the Town of Skaneateles (the "Village Board") appointed the Skaneateles Comprehensive Plan Special Board (the "CPSB") to prepare a proposed joint comprehensive plan for the Town of Skaneateles and the Village of Skaneateles, pursuant NY Town Law ("NY Town Law") § 272-a(4) and NY Village Law ("NY Village Law") § 7-722(4); and

WHEREAS, the CPSB recommended to the Town Board and the Village Board a proposed comprehensive plan, titled "Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015" (the "Proposed Comprehensive Plan") on May 4th, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board formally introduced the Proposed Comprehensive Plan on May 7, 2015 and the Village Board formally introduced the Proposed Comprehensive Plan on June 11, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and the Village Board made the Proposed Comprehensive Plan available for public review at each entity's clerk's office and on each entity's website; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board referred the Proposed Comprehensive Plan to the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board (the "Town Planning Board") and the Town of Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals (the "Town Zoning Board") for review and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Village Board referred the Proposed Comprehensive Plan to the Village of Skaneateles Planning Board (the "Village Planning Board") and the Village of Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals (the "Village Zoning Board") for review and recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the Town Planning Board and the Town Zoning Board both recommended that the Town Board adopt the Proposed Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and the Village Board received, and duly considered, comments and recommendations from the Town Planning Board, the Town Zoning Board, the Village Planning Board, and the Village Zoning Board; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with NY General Municipal Law § 239-m, the Town Board referred the Proposed Comprehensive Plan to the Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency ("SOCPA") for its review under said statute; and

WHEREAS, SOCPA approved the Town Board and the Village Board's adoption of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan and provided the following comments: "[SOCPA] commends the Town and Village for updating the Joint Comprehensive Plan, especially for its emphasis on the protection of rural land and open space, the promotion of smartgrowth principles, and the adoption of transect zones. [SOCPA] encourages a continued focus on infrastructure strategies and revisions to existing zoning and subdivision ordinances, in order to further the Town and Village goals to preserve natural resources and to support traditional neighborhood development;" and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NY Town Law § 272-a(6)(c) and NY Village Law § 21-2102, the Town Board and the Village Board held a joint public hearing on July 13, 2015 and duly considered the comments received during said hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and the Village Board initiated the environmental review procedures under the NY State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Part 617 of Title 6 of NY's Compilation of Codes, Rules, and Regulations ("SEQR's Regulations"), 6 NYCRR § 617.2(b) and 6 NYCRR § 617.3(g), the "action," as defined under SEQR, is the Town Board and the Village Board's adoption of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan (the "Proposed Action"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.4(b)(1), the Proposed Action is a Type I action under SEQR; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board and the Village Board each resolved that the Town Board would serve as Lead Agency for SEQR purposes with regard to the Proposed Action; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board identified the Town Board and the Village Board as the only involved agencies for SEQR purposes with regard to the Proposed Action; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board completed a SEQR Full Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") Part I for the Proposed Action ("EAF Part I"), a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board identified 27 interested agencies for SEQR purposes with regard to the Proposed Action and provided said agencies with: (A) notice of the Proposed Action; (B) a copy of the EAF Part I; (C) notice of the Town Board's appointment as Lead Agency; (D) an opportunity to comment on the Proposed Action; and (E) an opportunity to object to the Town Board's appointment as Lead Agency;

WHEREAS, none of the 27 interested agencies provided comments or recommendations to the Town Board and none of the 27 interested agencies objected to the Town Board's appointment as Lead Agency; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board desires to determine the significance of the Proposed Action pursuant to SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.7, and set forth its determination and its reasoning therefor, in this written resolution, pursuant to SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(b)(4),

#### NOW, THEREFORE, the Town Board:

# **RESOLVES** to adopt the following findings and determinations:

- (I) The Proposed Action, the adoption of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan, is the culmination of more than 12 months of research, collaboration, negotiation, and other work on behalf of many individuals and businesses inside and outside the Town and Village of Skaneateles.
- (II) The process to create the Proposed Comprehensive Plan began in 2014 with the formation of the CPSB. The CPSB included planners, professionals, and community volunteers who, among other tasks, reviewed the existing comprehensive plan, researched the issues and potential improvements in adopting a new comprehensive plan, and completed numerous meetings and work sessions to create the several drafts that ultimately became the Proposed Comprehensive Plan.
- (III) The CPSB obtained substantial public input and collaboration during public information sessions, which were held on December 8, 2014 and January 4, 2015, at which time the then-existing draft comprehensive plan was presented to the community and reviewed by the public, with participation encouraged. The public information sessions were well attended and resulted in dialogue between the public and the CPSB, as well as revisions to the initial draft based upon such dialogue. Furthermore, the public had an opportunity to meet with the CPSB, participate in working groups, and contribute to the ideas contained in the draft versions of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan. The CPSB conducted its official public hearing, as required by statute, on March 4, 2015.
- (IV) In preparing the Proposed Comprehensive Plan, the CPSB drew on its members' expertise, personal and professional experience, and knowledge of the Skaneateles community, as well as the following written documents and reports: (1) the Town of Skaneateles's existing comprehensive plan; (2) Strategies for Sustainable Skaneateles, prepared by the Graduate Urban Design Studio at the University of Notre Dame School of Architecture; (3) the Natural, Rural, Sub-Urban, General Urban, and

Urban Center Transect Zone Descriptions; (4) the Skaneateles Architectural & Visual Identification Team ("SAVIT") Sub-Committee Report; (5) the Skaneateles existing Open Space and Recreation Plan; (6) the Fennel Street Corridor Study; and (7) the Village of Skaneateles Climate Action Plan. In adopting this Resolution, including its negative declaration, the Town Board duly considered the same documents and reports.

- (V) In considering the Proposed Comprehensive Plan, the Town Board recognizes that, among the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals, was to preserve, protect, and improve the environmental elements of and in the Skaneateles community and that its drafters took care to avoid potential negative environmental impacts, especially avoiding those that could be considered significant negative environmental impacts.
- (VI) With regard to SEQR, the Town Board and the Village Board are the only involved agencies concerning the Proposed Action and both resolved that the Town Board shall serve as Lead Agency for SEQR purposes. Accordingly, in accordance with 6 NYCRR § 617.7(b)(3), the Town Board has taken a deliberate and thorough review of the potential areas of environmental concern, as set forth in SEQR's Regulations, to determine if the Proposed Action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

# (VII) In accordance with SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(b):

- (a) The Town Board has considered the Proposed Action in the context of the definitions regarding "actions" contained in SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.2(b) and 6 NYCRR § 617.3(g). As set forth herein above, the Proposed Action is the Town Board and the Village Board's adoption of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan. The Proposed Comprehensive Plan contains information, goals, and visions that will be utilized for planning purposes and municipal decisions for many years into the future. Although the Comprehensive Plan will impact such planning purposes and municipal decisions, nothing in the Proposed Comprehensive Plan requires immediate action of any entity. Likewise, while the Proposed Comprehensive Plan encourages potential future actions, the Town Board recognizes that any such potential future actions will be subject to their own environmental review under SEQR.
- (b) The Town Board reviewed the EAF Part I. Furthermore, the Town Board held a special meeting, noticed and open to the public, on August 6, 2015, to review and complete part II of the EAF ("EAF Part II"), a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B. As set forth in the NY Department of Environmental Conservation's "SEQR Handbook" ("SEQR Handbook"), EAF Part II assists lead agencies in identifying major environmental categories, major environmental impacts, and potential magnitudes of such environmental impacts (SEQR Handbook, page 74). The Town Board recognizes that the EAF Part II's content is derived from SEQR's regulations regarding the criteria for determining significance contained in SEQR Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1).

During its August 6, 2015 meeting, the Town Board thoroughly reviewed and considered each and every category set forth in the EAF Part II to determine whether the Proposed Action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment. In completing such review of the categories in the EAF Part II, the Town Board also reviewed and considered each and every indicator of significance set forth in SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1). The following is the Town Board's reasoned elaboration for its responses to the categories/indicators of the EAF Part II and SEQR's Regulations, 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1). The following also serves as, and satisfies, the Town Board's completion of the procedure outlined in part III of the EAF ("EAF Part III"), which is to explain why a particular element of the Proposed Action will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

- (1) Impact on Land (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(viii)). As indicated above, among the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals, was to preserve, protect, and improve the environmental elements of and in the Skaneateles community. The Town Board considered the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals and recommendations, including with regard to their impact on land, and determined that the Proposed Action would not cause a significant adverse environmental impact on land because the goals and recommendations were designed to be environmentally more protective for the Skaneateles community's land. For example, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's first and second goals suggest sustainability with regard to natural resources and preserving the rural landscapes in the Skaneateles community.
- (2) Impacts on Geological Features (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(ii)). The Town Board considered the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals and recommendations and determined that there would be no significant adverse environmental impact from the Proposed Action on geological features because the goals and recommendations were designed to be environmentally more protective of geological features, such as Skaneateles Lake and its tributaries. Furthermore, with regard to practices that may adversely affect the environmental, such as mining, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals and recommendations seek to end the expansion of such practices.
- Town Board considered the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals and recommendations with regard to this category and determined there would be no significant adverse environmental impact from the Proposed Action as the Proposed Comprehensive Plan does not propose any adverse change to surface water resources. Again, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals and recommendations were designed to be more environmentally protective. In reaching this conclusion, the Town Board discussed whether the future growth envisioned by the Proposed Comprehensive Plan could involve changes in wastewater treatment, but the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not require or necessarily lead to such changes. Thus, the Town

Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse environmental impact on surface water.

- (4) Impact on Groundwater (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)). The Town Board discussed the impact of the Proposed Action on groundwater and concluded that an impact would be environmentally positive. For example, as the Town Board discussed, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan encourages growth outside of the Skaneateles Lake watershed and suggests that expansion of practices that may adversely affect groundwater, such as mining, be curtailed. Thus, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse environmental impact on groundwater.
- (5) Impact on Flooding (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)). The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on flooding and concluded that the Proposed Comprehensive Plan does not encourage development of lands subject to flooding. Conversely, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan contains language that seeks to protect steep slopes, watercourses, and tributaries from adverse environmental impacts. In addition, the Town Board sought comment from its engineer regarding floodplains in the Skaneateles community and, in the engineer's opinion, there are not large floodplains in the Town of Skaneateles. Accordingly, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse environmental impact on flooding.
- (6) Impacts on Air (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)). The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on air. The Town Board requested further information from its engineer regarding this question. The Town Board's engineer did not identify any potential significant adverse environmental impact regarding air from the Proposed Action. The Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse environmental impact on air.
- (7) Impact on Plants and Animals (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(ii)). The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's impact on plants and animals. The Town Board considered the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's suggestion that residential and commercial development take place in certain parts of the Skaneateles community. As the Town Board discussed, even if the Proposed Action would impact plants and animals, the impact would not be significant. Accordingly, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse environmental impact on plants and animals.
- (8) Impact on Agricultural Resources (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(vii)). The Town Board considered the Proposed Actions impact on agricultural resources. The Town Board discussed whether the Proposed Action would affect an existing or planned land management system, which it concluded the Proposed Action would not. The Town Board concluded that there would be no

significant adverse environmental impact on agricultural resources as the Proposed Comprehensive Plan suggests that the agricultural land in the Skaneateles community be preserved, protected, and enhanced.

- (9) Impact on Aesthetic Resources (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(v)). The Town Board considered the Proposed Action's impact on aesthetic resources. In its discussions, the Town Board recognized that there is an existing comprehensive plan for the Town of Skaneateles. The Town Board further recognized that the Proposed Comprehensive Plan does not call for changes in aesthetics that are markedly different from the existing comprehensive plan. Furthermore, the Town Board recognized that among the goals of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan is the preservation, enhancement, and improvement of the Skaneateles community's aesthetic resources, such as the Village of Skaneateles, open space throughout the Town of Skaneateles, and view of Skaneateles Lake. Accordingly, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment regarding aesthetic resources.
- (10) Impact on Historical and Archeological Resources (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(viii)). The Town Board disused historical and archeological resources in the Skaneateles community. As the Proposed Comprehensive Plan calls for preservation of valuable historical and archeological resources in the Skaneateles community, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment concerning historical and archeological rescores.
- (11) Impact on Open Space and Recreation (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(viii)). The Town Board discussed the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's impact on open space and recreation. The Proposed Comprehensive Plan does not suggest that open or recreational space be diminished. On the contrary, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan encourages preservation of open space. Thus, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environmental with regard to open space and recreation.
- (12) Impact on Critical Environmental Areas (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(iii)). The Town Board determined that there would be no significant adverse environmental impacts on Critical Environmental Areas ("CEA") because there are no CEAs in the geological area covered by the proposed Comprehensive Plan.
- (13) Impact on Transportation (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(ix)). The Town Board considered the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's goals and recommendations with regard to transportation, including without limitation, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan's suggestions to improve walkability, increase the number of sidewalks, expand bike paths, and implement a plan for the Fennell Street commercial district. The Town Board determined that such goals and recommendations

would have positive environmental impacts on transportation. The Town Board further determined that to the extent the Proposed Comprehensive Plan affected transportation at all, there would be no significant adverse environmental impact.

- (14) Impact on Energy (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(vi)). The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on energy. As the Town Board discussed, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan encourages exploration of alternative and sustainable forms of energy, such as wind, water, and solar. The Proposed Comprehensive Plan also encourages changes in certain uses to more sustainable options. The Town Board requested further information from its engineer regarding this question. The Town Board's engineer did not identify any potential significant adverse environmental impact regarding energy from the Proposed Action. The Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment concerning energy.
- (15) Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(i)). The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on noise, odor, and light and whether the Proposed Comprehensive Plan would have an impact on these elements. The Town Board discussed how the Proposed Comprehensive Plan does not require any entity to take action, that there is no proposed project or development at this time, that the Proposed Comprehensive Plan is designed to be more environmentally protection, and that this element of the EAF Part II appeared to be more "site specific." Likewise, the Town Board also discussed that while the Proposed Comprehensive Plan encourages potential future actions, the Town Board recognizes that any such potential future actions will be subject to their own environmental review under SEQR. For these reasons, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment with regard to noise, odor, and light.
- (16) Impact on Human Health (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(vii). The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's impact on human health and whether the Proposed Comprehensive Plan would have any impact on human health at all. The Town Board discussed how the Proposed Comprehensive Plan does not require any entity to take action and that this element of the EAF Part II appeared to be more "site specific." Likewise, the Town Board also discussed that while the Proposed Comprehensive Plan encourages potential future actions, the Town Board recognizes that any such potential future actions will be subject to their own environmental review under SEQR. For these reasons, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment with regard to human health.
- (17) Consistency with Community Plans (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(iv)). The Town Board discussed the Proposed Action's consistency with other community plans. The Town Board recognized there is an existing comprehensive

plan for the Town of Skaneateles and further recognized that the Proposed Comprehensive Plan is, for the most part, consistent with the goals and aspirations of the existing one. Furthermore, the Town Board recognized that the Village of Skaneateles has an existing historic district plan and that the Proposed Comprehensive Plan is consistent with it as well. Accordingly, the Town Board concluded that the Proposed Comprehensive Plan would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment with regard to community plans.

(18) Consistency with Community Character (6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(1)(v)). The Town Board recognized that one of the main goals of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan was to preserve the Skaneateles community's character. Accordingly, while the Proposed Comprehensive Plan envisioned future growth in particular parts of the Skaneateles community, the Proposed Comprehensive Plan suggests that such growth be consistent with community character, that it takes place in areas targeted for such growth, and that it be completed in environmentally sustainable methods. For these reasons, the Town Board determined that the Proposed Action would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment with regard to community character.

(VIII) In reaching the above-described conclusions, the Town Board considered reasonably related long-term, short-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action, including other simultaneous or subsequent actions which are: (a) included in any long-range plan of which the Proposed Action is a part; (b) likely to be undertaken as a result thereof; or (c) dependent thereon. Furthermore, in reaching the above-described conclusions, the Town Board the considered the significance of a likely consequence (i.e., whether it is material, substantial, large, or important) in connection with: (a) its setting (e.g., urban or rural); (b) its probability of occurrence; (c) its duration; (d) its irreversibility; (e) its geographic scope; (f) its magnitude; and (g) the number of people affected.

FURTHER RESOLVES, that based on the foregoing, and pursuant to SEQR's Regulations for determining the significance of an action, 6 NYCRR § 617.7, the Proposed Action, a Type I action under SEQR's Regulations, will have no significant adverse environmental impacts and, therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement, as that term is defined in SEQR's Regulations, is not required for the Proposed Action; and

**FURTHER RESOLVES**, that based on the foregoing, and pursuant to SEQR's Regulations, the Town Board hereby issues a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** with regard to the Proposed Action and pursuant to SEQR; and

**FURTHER RESOLVES**, in accordance with SEQR's Regulations concerning preparation of documents, 6 NYCRR § 617.12(a), that: (A) this Resolution, including its negative declaration, has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the NY Environmental Conservation Law; (B) the Lead Agency is the Town Board of the Town of

Skaneateles with an address of 24 Jordan Street, Skaneateles, NY 13152; (C) Supervisor Mary Sennett, with an address of 24 Jordan Street, Skaneateles, NY 13152 and a phone number of 315-685-3473 can provide additional information with regard to the Proposed Action; (D) the Proposed Action is the Town Board and the Village Board's adoption of the Proposed Comprehensive Plan; (E) the Proposed Action is classified under SEQR as a Type I action; and (F) the location of the Proposed Action is the entirety of the Town of Skaneateles, County of Onondaga, and State of New York and Village of Skaneateles, County of Onondaga, and State of New York; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, in accordance with SEQR's Regulations concerning filing and distribution of documents, 6 NYCRR § 617.12(b), that: (A) this Resolution, including its negative declaration, will be filed with the Town Board and the Village Board; and (B) the following documents concerning the Proposed Action will be maintained in files at the Town Board that are readily accessible to the public and made available upon request: all SEQR documents and notices, including without limitation, this Resolution, including its negative declaration, and the EAFs regarding the Proposed Action; and

FURTHER RESOLVES, in accordance with SEQR's Regulations concerning publication of notices, 6 NYCRR § 617.12(c), that notice of this Resolution's Type I negative declaration shall be published in the Environmental Notice Bulletin (the "ENB") and the Town Board's Attorney is directed to complete said publishing in the ENB.

# **CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that at a meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles held at the Skaneateles Town Hall, located at 24 Jordan Street in the Town of Skaneateles, County of Onondaga, and State of New York on the 20th day of August, 2015, the foregoing Resolution, the Resolution Regarding Determination of Environmental Significance under SEQR for the Adoption of the Skaneateles, New York Joint Comprehensive Plan 2015, each of the 18 questions posed on the EAF Part 2 were read and each Town Board member voted "no" on each of the 18 questions, and the resolution was duly moved by Councilor Howard and seconded by Councilor Brace, a quorum of five members of the five-member Town Board being present, and each voted on the Resolution as follows:

anet L. Aaron, Town Clerk, Town of Skaneateles

Supervisor Mary Sennett	Yes
Councilor Connie Brace	Yes
Councilor Claire Howard	Yes
Councilor Jim Greenfield	Yes
Councilor Nancy Murray	Yes

The Resolution was, therefore, duly adopted.

Dated: August 21, 2015

Certification - Page 11 of 11

# Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 - Project and Setting

## **Instructions for Completing Part 1**

Part 1 is to be completed by the applicant or project sponsor. Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification.

Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information; indicate whether missing information does not exist, or is not reasonably available to the sponsor; and, when possible, generally describe work or studies which would be necessary to update or fully develop that information.

Applicants/sponsors must complete all items in Sections A & B. In Sections C, D & E, most items contain an initial question that must be answered either "Yes" or "No". If the answer to the initial question is "Yes", complete the sub-questions that follow. If the answer to the initial question is "No", proceed to the next question. Section F allows the project sponsor to identify and attach any additional information. Section G requires the name and signature of the project sponsor to verify that the information contained in Part 1 is accurate and complete.

#### A. Project and Sponsor Information.

	^^*	
ork Joint Comprehensive Plan	2015	
teles and the Village of Skanes 15."	ateles propose to jointly adopt a	
	•	
Telephone: (245) 605 24	73	
e of Skaneateles  E-Mail: MSennett@townofskaneateles.com		
State: New York	Zip Code: 13152	
Telephone: (315) 685-67	26	
E-Mail: MSennett@town	ofskaneateles.com	
State:	Zip Code:	
New York	13152	
Telephone:		
E-Mail:		
State:	Zip Code:	
	Telephone: (315) 685-34 E-Mail: MSennett@town  State: New York Telephone: (315) 685-67 E-Mail: MSennett@town  State: New York Telephone: E-Mail:	

# B. Government Approvals

B. Government Approvals assistance.)	, Funding, or Spor	asorship. ("Funding" includes grants, loans, to	ax relief, and any other	r forms of financial
Government I	Entity	If Yes: Identify Agency and Approval(s) Required	Applicati (Actual or 1	
a. City Council, Town Boar or Village Board of Trust	ees	Town Board of the Town of Skaneateles and Village Board of the Village of Skaneateles	May through July, 2015	
b. City, Town or Village Planning Board or Comm	□Yes□No iission		CONTRACTOR VARIOUS WAS BANAMESTY APPROPRIATE VARIOUS PARKETS AND ANALYSIS.	
c. City Council, Town or Village Zoning Board of				
d. Other local agencies	□Yes□No		OF THE PROPERTY OF	
e. County agencies	<b>☑</b> Yes ☐No	Syracuse-Onondaga County Planning Agency	June 12, 2015	
f. Regional agencies	□Yes□No			
g. State agencies	□Yes□No			
h. Federal agencies	□Yes□No			
i. Coastal Resources.     i. Is the project site with	in a Coastal Area, o	r the waterfront area of a Designated Inland W	aterway?	☑Yes□No
<ul> <li>ii. Is the project site located in a community with an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program?</li> <li>iii. Is the project site within a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area?</li> </ul>				
C. Planning and Zoning				
C.1. Planning and zoning a				
only approval(s) which mus  If Yes, complete se	t be granted to enab ctions C, F and G.	nendment of a plan, local law, ordinance, rule le the proposed action to proceed? uplete all remaining sections and questions in F	~	<b>☑</b> Yes□No
C.2. Adopted land use plan	lS.			
a. Do any municipally- adop where the proposed action		age or county) comprehensive land use plan(s)	include the site	☑Yes□No
		cific recommendations for the site where the p	roposed action	☑Yes□No
b. Is the site of the proposed Brownfield Opportunity A or other?) If Yes, identify the plan(s):	action within any k area (BOA); designa	ocal or regional special planning district (for exated State or Federal heritage area; watershed t	cample: Greenway nanagement plan;	☑Yes□No
are numerous special planning di	stricts within the physic	an for the entirety of the Town of Skaneateles and the cal boundaries of these municipalities. This section in generateles's SEQR review.	a Village of Skaneateles. s subject to further review	Accordingly, there rand will be
or an adopted municipal f If Yes, identify the plan(s):	armland protection	ally within an area listed in an adopted munici plan? an for the entirety of the Town of Skaneateles and the	, , ,	☑Yes□No  Accordingly, there
are numerous space plans within the Town of Skaneateles and Villa	the physical boundarie	es of these municipalities. This section is subject to f	urther review and will be	completed as part of

~			
C.3. Zoning			
a. Is the site of the proposed action located in a municipality was If Yes, what is the zoning classification(s) including any application	rith an adopted zoning law or ordinar able overlay district?	ıce.	☑Yes□No
The proposed action is adoption of a comprehensive plan for the entirety zoning classification varies across the physical lands of these municipal control of the control o	y of the Town of Skaneateles and the Villa ties.	ge of Skaneateles.	Accordingly, the
b. Is the use permitted or allowed by a special or conditional u	se permit?	Not applicable.	□Yes□No
<ul><li>c. Is a zoning change requested as part of the proposed action?</li><li>If Yes,</li><li>i. What is the proposed new zoning for the site?</li></ul>	Please note that, assuming adoption of comprehensive plan, the Town and the N		☐ Yes☑No oning law changes.
C.4. Existing community services.			
a. In what school district is the project site located? Skaneateles  District, More	Central Schools, Jordan-Elbridge Central avia School District	School District, Ma	rcellus School
b. What police or other public protection forces serve the proje	ct site?		
Onondaga County Sheriff's Office and Village of Skaneateles Police Dep	partment.		
c. Which fire protection and emergency medical services serve			
Skaneateles Fire Department and Skaneateles Ambulance Volunteer En	nergency Services.		
d. What parks serve the project site?			
The proposed action is adoption of a comprehensive plan for the entirety are numerous parks within the physical boundaries of these municipalities.	of the Town of Skaneateles and the Villa es.	ge of Skaneateles,	Accordingly, there
D. Project Details			
D.1. Proposed and Potential Development	ACCAMANA DA RANTO DELLA COLLA PERSONA DE PORTE DE LA COLLA PERSONA DE LA COLLA DE LA COLLA DELLA COLLA		
a. What is the general nature of the proposed action (e.g., resid components)?	ential, industrial, commercial, recreat	tional; if mixed, i	nclude all
b. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action?	acres	-	
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed?	acres		
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor?	owned acres		
c. Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or <i>i</i> . If Yes, what is the approximate percentage of the proposed square feet)? %	use? I expansion and identify the units (e.g Units:	g., acres, miles, h	☐ Yes☐No ousing units,
d. Is the proposed action a subdivision, or does it include a sub	division?		□Yes □No
<ul><li>i. Purpose or type of subdivision? (e.g., residential, industrial</li></ul>	, commercial; if mixed, specify types	)	
ii. Is a cluster/conservation layout proposed? iii. Number of lots proposed?			□Yes □No
iv. Minimum and maximum proposed lot sizes? Minimum	Maximum		
e. Will proposed action be constructed in multiple phases?  i. If No, anticipated period of construction:			□Yes□No
ii. If Yes:	months		
<ul> <li>Total number of phases anticipated</li> </ul>	***************************************		
Anticipated commencement date of phase 1 (including the second seco			
<ul> <li>Anticipated completion date of final phase</li> <li>Generally describe connections or relationships among determine timing or duration of future phases:</li> </ul>	month month g phases, including any contingencies	where progress	of one phase may
			MINORAL MARKET M

	ct include new resid				□Yes□No
If Yes, show num	obers of units propos		There Forester	Navitation In The continue (Consequence)	
	One Family	Two Family	Three Family	Multiple Family (four or more)	
Initial Phase		<del></del>			
At completion					
of all phases		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>	
g. Does the propo	sed action include	new non-residenti	al construction (inclu	iding expansions)?	□Yes□No
If Yes,			•	•	
i. Total number	of structures				
ii. Dimensions (	in feet) of largest pr	oposed structure:	height;	width; andlength	
				square feet	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				l result in the impoundment of any	□Yes□No
If Yes,	s creation of a water	supply, reservoir	, pond, lake, waste k	agoon or other storage?	
	impoundment:				
ii. If a water imp	oundment, the princ	ipal source of the	water:	Ground water Surface water stream	ns Other specify:
iii. If other than w	vater, identify the ty	pe of impounded/	contained liquids an	d their source.	
in Approximate	cita of the propose	I impoundment	Volumes	million gallons; surface area:	
v. Approximate	size of the proposed f the proposed dam	ı unpounumem. or impounding st	voiune;		acres
vi. Construction	method/materials for	or the proposed da	m or impounding st	ructure (e.g., earth fill, rock, wood, cond	crete):
				,,	
		<del></del>			
D.2. Project Ope	erations				
a. Does the propo	sed action include a	ny excavation, m	ining, or dredging, d	uring construction, operations, or both?	☐Yes ☐No
(Not including	general site prepara	tion, grading or in	stallation of utilities	or foundations where all excavated	Camana Branca
materials will re	emain onsite)				
If Yes:	64				
i. What is the pu	rpose of the excava	non or dredging?	a sta Via mana saad s	o be removed from the site?	
Nolume     Volume	(specify tons or cub	k, caiui, scumicii ie varde):	s, etc.) is proposed t	o be removed from the site?	
Over wh	at duration of time?	ne yards).			
iii. Describe natur	e and characteristic	s of materials to b	e excavated or dreds	ged, and plans to use, manage or dispose	e of them.
* ****** .4 1					
	onsite dewatering o				YesNo
ii yes, desciit	De				
y What is the to	tal area to be dredge	ed or excavated?		acres	
			time?		
			or dredging?		
viii. Will the exca	vation require blast	ing?	0 0		□Yes□No
ix. Summarize site	e reclamation goals	and plan:			
		***************************************			
		***************************************	****		
				crease in size of, or encroachment	☐Yes☐No
	ng wetland, waterbo	dy, shoreline, bea	ch or adjacent area?		na n
If Yes:	etland or waterhods	which would be	affected thy name w	vater index number, wetland map numb	er or geographic
				vater index number, wedand map numb	or or Reokratume

ii. Describe how the proposed action would affect that waterbody or wetland, e.g. excavation, fill, placement of structures, or alteration of channels, banks and shorelines. Indicate extent of activities, alterations and additions in square feet or acres:				
iii. Will proposed action cause or result in disturbance to bottom sediments?  If Yes, describe:	□Yes□No			
<ul><li>iv. Will proposed action cause or result in the destruction or removal of aquatic vegetation?</li><li>If Yes:</li></ul>	□Yes□No			
acres of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed:				
expected acreage of aquatic vegetation remaining after project completion:				
purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access):				
proposed method of plant removal:				
if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s):				
v. Describe any proposed reclamation/mitigation following disturbance:	- <del>1</del>			
	DATE:			
c. Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water?  If Yes:	□Yes □No			
i. Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: gallons/day				
ii. Will the proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply?	□Yes□No			
If Yes:				
Name of district or service area:				
<ul> <li>Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal?</li> </ul>	☐ Yes ☐ No			
<ul><li>Is the project site in the existing district?</li></ul>	□Yes□No			
• Is expansion of the district needed?	☐ Yes☐ No			
<ul><li>Do existing lines serve the project site?</li></ul>	☐ Yes ☐ No			
iii. Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to supply the project? If Yes:	□Yes □No			
Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project:				
C(-) - C				
• Source(s) of supply for the district:  iv. Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site?	☐ Yes☐No			
If, Yes:				
Applicant/sponsor for new district:     Date application submitted or anticipated:				
<ul> <li>Date application submitted or anticipated:</li> <li>Proposed source(s) of supply for new district:</li> </ul>				
v. If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project:	W. C.			
The proof of the supply will not be used, describe plant to provide white supply for all project.				
vi. If water supply will be from wells (public or private), maximum pumping capacity: gallons/min	oute.			
d. Will the proposed action generate liquid wastes?	□Yes□No			
If Yes:				
<ul> <li>i. Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day: gallons/day</li> <li>ii. Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all</li> </ul>				
ii. Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all	components and			
approximate volumes or proportions of each):				
iii. Will the proposed action use any existing public wastewater treatment facilities?	☐Yes ☐No			
If Yes:				
Name of wastewater treatment plant to be used:				
Name of district:	Project Project			
<ul> <li>Does the existing wastewater treatment plant have capacity to serve the project?</li> <li>Is the project site in the existing district?</li> </ul>	□Yes□No			
Is the project site in the existing district?  Is expansion of the district needed?	□Yes□No □Yes□No			
- 15 expansion of the district needed:	TT 1 C2 THAN			

<ul> <li>Do existing sewer lines serve the project site?</li> </ul>	☐Yes ☐No			
• Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to serve the project?	□Yes□No			
If Yes:				
Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project:				
' Will a second of the second				
iv. Will a new wastewater (sewage) treatment district be formed to serve the project site?  If Yes:	□Yes□No			
A ADDITIONAL OF CASON AND ADDITION CONTRACTOR AND ADDITIONAL CONTRACTOR ADDITIONAL CONTRACTOR AND ADDITIONAL CONTRACTOR AN	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
<ul> <li>Date application submitted or anticipated:</li> <li>What is the receiving water for the wastewater discharge?</li> </ul>				
v. If public facilities will not be used, describe plans to provide wastewater treatment for the project, including spe	cifying proposed			
receiving water (name and classification if surface discharge, or describe subsurface disposal plans):	onying proposed			
vi. Describe any plans or designs to capture, recycle or reuse liquid waste:				
TV/11.1	prod + 2 prod + +			
e. Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff, either from new point sources (i.e. ditches, pipes, swales, curbs, gutters or other concentrated flows of stormwater) or non-point	□Yes□No			
source (i.e. sheet flow) during construction or post construction?				
If Yes:				
i. How much impervious surface will the project create in relation to total size of project parcel?				
Square feet oracres (impervious surface)				
Square feet or acres (parcel size)				
ii. Describe types of new point sources.				
· 3				
iii. Where will the stormwater runoff be directed (i.e. on-site stormwater management facility/structures, adjacent	properties,			
groundwater, on-site surface water or off-site surface waters)?				
	****			
If to surface waters, identify receiving water bodies or wetlands:	·			
Will stamps rotar was off flow to a discourt was said and	[]\z[]\t			
<ul> <li>Will stormwater runoff flow to adjacent properties?</li> <li>iv. Does proposed plan minimize impervious surfaces, use pervious materials or collect and re-use stormwater?</li> </ul>	□Yes□No □Yes□No			
f. Does the proposed action include, or will it use on-site, one or more sources of air emissions, including fuel	□Yes□No			
combustion, waste incineration, or other processes or operations?  If Yes, identify:				
i. Mobile sources during project operations (e.g., heavy equipment, fleet or delivery vehicles)				
ii. Stationary sources during construction (e.g., power generation, structural heating, batch plant, crushers)				
iii. Stationary sources during operations (e.g., process emissions, large boilers, electric generation)				
g. Will any air emission sources named in D.2.f (above), require a NY State Air Registration, Air Facility Permit,	□Yes□No			
or Federal Clean Air Act Title IV or Title V Permit?				
If Yes:	Franks			
i. Is the project site located in an Air quality non-attainment area? (Area routinely or periodically fails to meet	□Yes□No			
ambient air quality standards for all or some parts of the year)				
ii. In addition to emissions as calculated in the application, the project will generate:				
Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> )				
Tons/year (short tons) of Nitrous Oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O)				
Tons/year (short tons) of Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)				
•Tons/year (short tons) of Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF <sub>6</sub> )				
<ul> <li>Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide equivalent of Hydroflourocarbons (HFCs)</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>Tons/year (short tons) of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)</li> </ul>				

h. Will the proposed action generate or emit methane (including, but not limited to, sewage treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities)?  If Yes:  i. Estimate methane generation in tons/year (metric):  ii. Describe any methane capture, control or elimination measures included in project design (e.g., combustion to g electricity, flaring):	_Yes_No enerate heat or			
i. Will the proposed action result in the release of air pollutants from open-air operations or processes, such as quarry or landfill operations?  If Yes: Describe operations and nature of emissions (e.g., diesel exhaust, rock particulates/dust):	∐Yes∏No			
j. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services?  If Yes:  i. When is the peak traffic expected (Check all that apply):	☐Yes☐No ☐Yes☐No access, describe:			
<ul> <li>vi. Are public/private transportation service(s) or facilities available within ½ mile of the proposed site?</li> <li>vii Will the proposed action include access to public transportation or accommodations for use of hybrid, electric or other alternative fueled vehicles?</li> <li>viii. Will the proposed action include plans for pedestrian or bicycle accommodations for connections to existing pedestrian or bicycle routes?</li> </ul>				
k. Will the proposed action (for commercial or industrial projects only) generate new or additional demand				
l. Hours of operation. Answer all items which apply.  i. During Construction:  Monday - Friday:  Saturday:  Sunday:  Holidays:  Holidays:				

m. Will the proposed action produce noise that will exceed existing ambient noise levels during construction, operation, or both?  If yes:  i. Provide details including sources, time of day and duration:	□Yes□No
ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a noise barrier or screen?  Describe:	□Yes□No
n Will the proposed action have outdoor lighting?  If yes:  i. Describe source(s), location(s), height of fixture(s), direction/aim, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:	□Yes□No
<ul> <li>ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a light barrier or screen?</li> <li>Describe:</li> </ul>	□Yes□No
Does the proposed action have the potential to produce odors for more than one hour per day?  If Yes, describe possible sources, potential frequency and duration of odor emissions, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:	□Yes□No
p. Will the proposed action include any bulk storage of petroleum (combined capacity of over 1,100 gallons) or chemical products 185 gallons in above ground storage or any amount in underground storage?  If Yes:  i. Product(s) to be stored  ii. Volume(s) per unit time (e.g., month, year)  iii. Generally describe proposed storage facilities:	□Yes□No
<ul> <li>q. Will the proposed action (commercial, industrial and recreational projects only) use pesticides (i.e., herbicides, insecticides) during construction or operation?</li> <li>If Yes: <ul> <li>i. Describe proposed treatment(s):</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes ☐No
ii. Will the proposed action use Integrated Pest Management Practices?	☐ Yes ☐No
r. Will the proposed action (commercial or industrial projects only) involve or require the management or disposal of solid waste (excluding hazardous materials)?  If Yes:  i. Describe any solid waste(s) to be generated during construction or operation of the facility:  Construction:  tons per  (unit of time)  ii. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of materials to avoid disposal as solid waste:  Construction:	☐ Yes ☐No
Operation:	
<ul> <li>iii. Proposed disposal methods/facilities for solid waste generated on-site;</li> <li>Construction:</li> </ul>	
Operation:	

s. Does the proposed action include construction or modification of a solid waste management facility?				
If Yes:  i. Type of management or handling of waste proposed			g, landfill, or	
other disposal activities):	**************************************	·		
Tons/month, if transfer or other non-	combustion/thermal treatmen	at, or		
<ul> <li>Tons/hour, if combustion or thermal</li> </ul>	treatment			
iii. If landfill, anticipated site life:	years	•		
t. Will proposed action at the site involve the commercial waste?	l generation, treatment, stora	ge, or disposal of hazardous	□Yes□No	
If Yes:  i. Name(s) of all hazardous wastes or constituents to be	e generated, handled or mana	ged at facility:		
Value 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10		**************************************		
ii. Generally describe processes or activities involving				
		**************************************		
iii. Specify amount to be handled or generatedt iv. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, rec	ons/month cycling or reuse of hazardous	constituents:		
v. Will any hazardous wastes be disposed at an existing If Yes: provide name and location of facility:	g offsite hazardous waste fac	ility?	□Yes□No	
If No: describe proposed management of any hazardous	wastes which will not be sen	t to a hazardous waste facility	7.	
The second of the second secon	Wastes Willest Will het de Son	TO UNIZERIOUS WESTO RESILL		
E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action				
E.1. Land uses on and surrounding the project site				
a. Existing land uses.				
i. Check all uses that occur on, adjoining and near the Urban Industrial Commercial Residual	project site.	al (non-form)		
Forest Agriculture Aquatic Othe	r (specify):	ii (non-ianii)		
ii. If mix of uses, generally describe:	F	***************************************		
b. Land uses and covertypes on the project site.				
Land use or	Current	Acreage After	Change	
Covertype	Acreage	Project Completion	(Acres +/-)	
<ul> <li>Roads, buildings, and other paved or impervious surfaces</li> </ul>				
Forested				
Meadows, grasslands or brushlands (non-				
agricultural, including abandoned agricultural)	T-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1			
Agricultural				
(includes active orchards, field, greenhouse etc.)  Surface water features	Miles Miles and the second sec			
(lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, etc.)				
Wetlands (freshwater or tidal)				
Non-vegetated (bare rock, earth or fill)				
• Other				
Describe:				

c. Is the project site presently used by members of the community for public recreation?  i. If Yes: explain:	□Yes□No
d. Are there any facilities serving children, the elderly, people with disabilities (e.g., schools, hospitals, licensed day care centers, or group homes) within 1500 feet of the project site?  If Yes,	□Yes□No
i. Identify Facilities:	
	Saturated " Emmand of &
e. Does the project site contain an existing dam?  If Yes:	□Yes□No
i. Dimensions of the dam and impoundment:	
Dam height:     feet	
Dam length:  feet	
• Surface area: acres	
Volume impounded:     gallons OR acre-feet	
ii. Dam's existing hazard classification:  iii. Provide date and summarize results of last inspection:	
III. Provide date and summarize results of last inspection,	
f. Has the project site ever been used as a municipal, commercial or industrial solid waste management facility,	□Yes□No
or does the project site adjoin property which is now, or was at one time, used as a solid waste management faci	lity?
if Yes:	
i. Has the facility been formally closed?	☐Yes☐ No
• If yes, cite sources/documentation:	
ii. Describe the location of the project site relative to the boundaries of the solid waste management facility:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
iii. Describe any development constraints due to the prior solid waste activities:	
g. Have hazardous wastes been generated, treated and/or disposed of at the site, or does the project site adjoin property which is now or was at one time used to commercially treat, store and/or dispose of hazardous waste? f Yes:	□Yes□No
	ed:
i. Describe waste(s) handled and waste management activities, including approximate time when activities occurre	
	□Ves□ No
i. Describe waste(s) handled and waste management activities, including approximate time when activities occurred.  Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  f Yes:	□Yes□ No
Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?	□Yes□ No
n. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  f Yes:  i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply:  Yes - Spills Incidents database  Provide DEC ID number(s):	□Yes□No
a. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  f Yes:  i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply:	□Yes□No
n. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  f Yes:  i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply:  Yes - Spills Incidents database  Provide DEC ID number(s):  Yes - Environmental Site Remediation database  Provide DEC ID number(s):	□Yes□No
n. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  f Yes:  i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply:  Yes - Spills Incidents database Provide DEC ID number(s):  Yes - Environmental Site Remediation database Neither database  i. If site has been subject of RCRA corrective activities, describe control measures:  iii. Is the project within 2000 feet of any site in the NYSDEC Environmental Site Remediation database?	□Yes□No
n. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  f Yes:  i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply:  Yes - Spills Incidents database Provide DEC ID number(s):  Yes - Environmental Site Remediation database Neither database  i. If site has been subject of RCRA corrective activities, describe control measures:	□Yes□No

v. Is the project site subject to an institutional control limiting property uses?	□Yes□No
If yes, DEC site ID number:	**************************************
Describe the type of institutional control (e.g., deed restriction or easement):	
Describe any use limitations:     Describe any engineering controls:	
<ul> <li>Describe any engineering controls:</li> <li>Will the project affect the institutional or engineering controls in place?</li> </ul>	☐Yes ☐No
Explain:	[] 1 es[[]10
,	
E.2. Natural Resources On or Near Project Site	
a. What is the average depth to bedrock on the project site? feet	
b. Are there bedrock outcroppings on the project site?	YesNo
If Yes, what proportion of the site is comprised of bedrock outcroppings?%	havani — — — financi — — —
c. Predominant soil type(s) present on project site:	%
	<u></u> %
	%
d. What is the average depth to the water table on the project site? Average: feet	
e. Drainage status of project site soils: Well Drained: % of site	
☐ Moderately Well Drained: % of site	
Poorly Drained % of site	
f. Approximate proportion of proposed action site with slopes: 0-10%: % o	of site
	f site
15% or greater:% o	f site
g. Are there any unique geologic features on the project site?	□Yes□No
If Yes, describe:	
h. Surface water features.	
i. Does any portion of the project site contain wetlands or other waterbodies (including streams, rive	ers, □Yes□No
ponds or lakes)?	
ii. Do any wetlands or other waterbodies adjoin the project site?	□Yes□No
If Yes to either i or ii, continue. If No, skip to E.2.i.	
iii. Are any of the wetlands or waterbodies within or adjoining the project site regulated by any feder	ral, □Yes□No
state or local agency?	, ,
iv. For each identified regulated wetland and waterbody on the project site, provide the following into Streams: Name Classification	formation:
And the second s	
Wetlands: Name Approxim	nate Size
wedand No. (If regulated by DEC)	
v. Are any of the above water bodies listed in the most recent compilation of NYS water quality-imp waterbodies?	aired □Yes□No
If yes, name of impaired water body/bodies and basis for listing as impaired:	
i. Is the project site in a designated Floodway?	□Yes □No
j. Is the project site in the 100 year Floodplain?	□Yes □No
k. Is the project site in the 500 year Floodplain?	□Yes□No
1. Is the project site located over, or immediately adjoining, a primary, principal or sole source aquife	r?
If Yes:	Assessed to the belower to
i. Name of aquifer:	

m. Identify the predominant wildlife species that occupy or use the project site:		
n. Does the project site contain a designated significant natural community?		□Yes □No
If Yes:  i. Describe the habitat/community (composition, function, and basis for design	ation):	
ii. Source(s) of description or evaluation:		
<ul><li>iii. Extent of community/habitat:</li><li>Currently:</li></ul>	acres	
Following completion of project as proposed:	acres	
• Gain or loss (indicate + or -):	acres	
o. Does project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by the fe	deral government or NYS as	☐ Yes☐No
endangered or threatened, or does it contain any areas identified as habitat for	an endangered or threatened specie	
p. Does the project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by N	YS as rare, or as a species of	□Yes□No
special concern?		
q. Is the project site or adjoining area currently used for hunting, trapping, fishin	g or shell fishing?	☐Yes☐No
If yes, give a brief description of how the proposed action may affect that use:		
E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site		
a. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in a designated agricultural dist	rict certified pursuant to	□Yes□No
Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304?		
If Yes, provide county plus district name/number:		
b. Are agricultural lands consisting of highly productive soils present?		□Yes □No
i. If Yes: acreage(s) on project site?		
ii. Source(s) of soil rating(s):		
c. Does the project site contain all or part of, or is it substantially contiguous to,	a registered National	∐Yes ☐No
Natural Landmark? If Yes:		Market Commence of the Commenc
i. Nature of the natural landmark:   Biological Community	Geological Feature	4
ii. Provide brief description of landmark, including values behind designation	and approximate size/extent:	······································
d. Is the project site located in or does it adjoin a state listed Critical Environmen	atal Area?	□Yes□No
If Yes:  i. CEA name:		***************************************
i. CEA name:  ii. Basis for designation:		
iii. Designating agency and date:		
		1

e. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on, or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on, the State or National Register of Historic Places?  If Yes:	□Yes□No
i. Nature of historic/archaeological resource: Archaeological Site Historic Building or District ii. Name:	
iii. Brief description of attributes on which listing is based:	
f. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory?	□Yes□No
g. Have additional archaeological or historic site(s) or resources been identified on the project site?  If Yes:	∐Yes∐No
i. Describe possible resource(s):  ii. Basis for identification:	
h. Is the project site within fives miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource?  If Yes:  i. Identify resource:	∐Yes ∏No
ii. Nature of, or basis for, designation (e.g., established highway overlook, state or local park, state historic trail or	scenic byway,
etc.): miles.	
<ul> <li>i. Is the project site located within a designated river corridor under the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Program 6 NYCRR 666?</li> <li>If Yes:  i. Identify the name of the river and its designation:</li> </ul>	□Yes□No
ii. Is the activity consistent with development restrictions contained in 6NYCRR Part 666?	□Yes□No
F. Additional Information Attach any additional information which may be needed to clarify your project.  If you have identified any adverse impacts which could be associated with your proposal, please describe those in measures which you propose to avoid or minimize them.	npacts plus any
G. Verification I certify that the information provided is true to the best of my knowledge.	
Applicant/Sponsor Name Town of Skaneateles and Village of Skaneateles Date June 12, 2015	- A. M.
Signature Title Thomas E. Taylor, Attorney for Town of S	skaneateles

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Identification of Potential Project Impacts

	Agency Use Only [If applicable]
Project:	
Date:	

Part 2 is to be completed by the lead agency. Part 2 is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be affected by a proposed project or action. We recognize that the lead agency's reviewer(s) will not necessarily be environmental professionals. So, the questions are designed to walk a reviewer through the assessment process by providing a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part 1. To further assist the lead agency in completing Part 2, the form identifies the most relevant questions in Part 1 that will provide the information needed to answer the Part 2 question. When Part 2 is completed, the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

If the lead agency is a state agency and the action is in any Coastal Area, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment.

#### Tips for completing Part 2:

- Review all of the information provided in Part 1.
- Review any application, maps, supporting materials and the Full EAF Workbook.
- Answer each of the 18 questions in Part 2.
- If you answer "Yes" to a numbered question, please complete all the questions that follow in that section.
- If you answer "No" to a numbered question, move on to the next numbered question.
- Check appropriate column to indicate the anticipated size of the impact.
- Proposed projects that would exceed a numeric threshold contained in a question should result in the reviewing agency
  checking the box "Moderate to large impact may occur."
- The reviewer is not expected to be an expert in environmental analysis.
- If you are not sure or undecided about the size of an impact, it may help to review the sub-questions for the general question and consult the workbook.
- When answering a question consider all components of the proposed activity, that is, the "whole action".
- Consider the possibility for long-term and cumulative impacts as well as direct impacts.
- Answer the question in a reasonable manner considering the scale and context of the project.

1. Impact on Land Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1)  If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 2.	Anc		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.	E2d		
b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.	E2f		
c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.	E2a		
d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.	D2a		l
e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.	Dle		
f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).	D2e, D2q		П
g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.	B1i		
h. Other impacts:			

2. Impact on Geological Features  The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhib access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g)  If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", move on to Section 3.	it NO	) [	YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Identify the specific land form(s) attached:	E2g	П	
b. The proposed action may affect or is adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark.  Specific feature:	ЕЗс	П	П
c. Other impacts:		П	
	1		
3. Impacts on Surface Water  The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h)  If "Yes", answer questions a - l. If "No", move on to Section 4.	Muc		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may create a new water body.	D2b, D1h		П
b. The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.	D2b		
c. The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.	D2a		
d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.	E2h		П
<ul> <li>The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.</li> </ul>	D2a, D2h		
f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.	D2c		
g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).	D2d	О	
h. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.	D2e	П	
i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or		,	
downstream of the site of the proposed action.	E2h	П	<u> </u>
	E2h D2q, E2h		

I. Other impacts:			
4. Impact on groundwater  The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer.  (See Part 1. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t)  If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 5.			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
The proposed action may require new water supply wells, or create additional demand on supplies from existing water supply wells.	D2c		
Water supply demand from the proposed action may exceed safe and sustainable withdrawal capacity rate of the local supply or aquifer.  Cite Source:	D2c	П	
c. The proposed action may allow or result in residential uses in areas without water and sewer services.	Dla, D2c		П
d. The proposed action may include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater.	D2d, E2l		П
e. The proposed action may result in the construction of water supply wells in locations where groundwater is, or is suspected to be, contaminated.	D2c, E1f, E1g, E1h	П	П
f. The proposed action may require the bulk storage of petroleum or chemical products over ground water or an aquifer.	D2p, E2l		
g. The proposed action may involve the commercial application of pesticides within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.	E2h, D2q, E2l, D2c		
h. Other impacts:			П
5. Impact on Flooding  The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding.  (See Part 1. E.2)  If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", move on to Section 6.	No		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in development in a designated floodway.	E2i		
b. The proposed action may result in development within a 100 year floodplain.	E2j	П	
c. The proposed action may result in development within a 500 year floodplain.	E2k		П
d. The proposed action may result in, or require, modification of existing drainage patterns.	D2b, D2e		
e. The proposed action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding.	D2b, E2i, E2j, E2k	П	
f. If there is a dam located on the site of the proposed action, is the dam in need of repair, or ungrade?	E1e		

g. Other impacts:			П
6. Impacts on Air  The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source.  (See Part 1. D.2.f., D,2,h, D.2.g)  If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", move on to Section 7.	Muc	·	YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
<ul> <li>a. If the proposed action requires federal or state air emission permits, the action may also emit one or more greenhouse gases at or above the following levels: <ol> <li>More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)</li> <li>More than 3.5 tons/year of nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)</li> <li>More than 1000 tons/year of carbon equivalent of perfluorocarbons (PFCs)</li> <li>More than .045 tons/year of sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)</li> <li>More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalent of hydrochloroflourocarbons (HFCs) emissions</li> <li>43 tons/year or more of methane</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	D2g D2g D2g D2g D2g D2g	00000	
b. The proposed action may generate 10 tons/year or more of any one designated hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons/year or more of any combination of such hazardous air pollutants.	D2g		
c. The proposed action may require a state air registration, or may produce an emissions rate of total contaminants that may exceed 5 lbs. per hour, or may include a heat source capable of producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour.	D2f, D2g	П	
d. The proposed action may reach 50% of any of the thresholds in "a" through "c", above.	D2g		
e. The proposed action may result in the combustion or thermal treatment of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour.	D2s	П	
f. Other impacts:		П	
7. Impact on Plants and Animals  The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2. 1  If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 8.	nq.)	No	YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E20		
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.	E20		
c. The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2p		
d. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.	E2p		

e. The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.	Е3с		
f. The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community.  Source:	E2n		
g. The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.	E2m	П	
h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat.  Habitat type & information source:	E1b		
i. Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.	D2q		П
j. Other impacts:			
8. Impact on Agricultural Resources  The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. a If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 9.	md b.)	Жио	□YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.	E2c, E3b		
b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc).	Ela, Elb		П
c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land.	ЕЗЪ	П	П
1 27 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1		
d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.	Elb, E3a		
uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10	E1b, E3a El a, E1b	0	0
uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.  e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land			
uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.  e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system.  f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development	El a, E1b	П	

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources  The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. (Part 1. E.1.a, E.1.b, E.3.h.)  If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 10.	N	0 [	]YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource.	E3h	П	
b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views.	E3h, C2b	П	П
c. The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points: i. Seasonally (e.g., screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons) ii. Year round	E3h		
d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is:  i. Routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work  ii. Recreational or tourism based activities	E3h E2q, E1c		
e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource.	E3h	П	П
f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project:  0-1/2 mile ½-3 mile 3-5 mile 5+ mile	D1a, E1a, D1f, D1g		
g. Other impacts:		П	ū
10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources  The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (Part 1. E.3.e, f. and g.)  If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 11.			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on the State or National Register of Historic Places.	E3e	П	
<ul> <li>The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory.</li> </ul>	E3f	П	
c. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. Source:	E3g		

d. Other impacts:		П	
e. If any of the above (a-d) are answered "Yes", continue with the following questions to help support conclusions in Part 3:		dermande van Paler - <del>San</del> Vander in de Paler - 1844 - 1860 in 184	
The proposed action may result in the destruction or alteration of all or part of the site or property.	E3e, E3g, E3f	П	
ii. The proposed action may result in the alteration of the property's setting or integrity.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E1a, E1b		
iii. The proposed action may result in the introduction of visual elements which are out of character with the site or property, or may alter its setting.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E3h, C2, C3	П	
11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation		×	
The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan.  (See Part 1. C.2.c, E.1.c., E.2.q.)	N	o 🔲	YES
If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 12.			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in an impairment of natural functions, or "ecosystem services", provided by an undeveloped area, including but not limited to stormwater storage, nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat.	D2e, E1b E2h, E2m, E2o, E2n, E2p		
b. The proposed action may result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource.	C2a, E1c, C2c, E2q		П
c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resource in an area with few such resources.	C2a, C2c E1c, E2q	П	П
d. The proposed action may result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource.	C2c, E1c		П
e. Other impacts:			
		,	
12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas  The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d)  If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", go to Section 13.	N	0 [	YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quantity of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	П	П
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quality of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d		
c. Other impacts:			

13. Impact on Transportation  The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems (See Part 1. D.2.j)  **Transportation**	. Divid	o D	YES
If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 14.	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.	D2j		
b. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.	D2j	U	
c. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.	D2j	П	
d. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.	D2j	П	П
e. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.	D2j		П
f. Other impacts:			П
		e de la companya della companya dell	
14. Impact on Energy  The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy.  (See Part 1. D.2.k)  **West" grouper questions a . a. If "No" go to Section 15	DW	, о П	YES
If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 15.	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation.	D2k	· 🗀	
b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use.	D1f, D1q, D2k		
c. The proposed action may utilize more than 2,500 MWhrs per year of electricity.	D2k		П
d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.	D1g		
e. Other Impacts:			
		<u> </u>	}
15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light  The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor ligh  (See Part 1. D.2.m., n., and o.)  If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 16.	ting. NO		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.	D2m	П	
b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.	D2m, E1d		
c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.	D2o		

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.	D2n		
e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.	D2n, E1a		П
f. Other impacts:		П	П
	2		l
16. Impact on Human Health  The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. and h.)  If "Yes", answer questions a - m. If "No", go to Section 17.			
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No,or small impact may eccur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.	Eld		
b. The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.	Elg, Elh		
c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.	Elg, Elh		
d. The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).	Elg, Elh		
e. The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.	Elg, Elh		
f. The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.	D2t	П	
g. The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.	D2q, E1f		
h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.	D2q, E1f		
i. The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste.	D2r, D2s		
j. The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.	Elf, Elg Elh	П	
k. The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off site structures.	E1f, E1g	П	
The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.	D2s, E1f, D2r		
m. Other impacts:			

17. Consistency with Community Plans  The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans.  (See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.)  If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", go to Section 18.	Xvo		/ES
y res , answer questions a - n. ly tho , go to bettion to.	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action's land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).	C2, C3, D1a E1a, E1b		D
b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.	C2	口	
c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.	C2, C2, C3		
d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.	C2, C2		П
e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.	C3, D1c, D1d, D1f, D1d, Elb		
f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.	C4, D2c, D2d D2j		
g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)	C2a		О
h. Other:			
18. Consistency with Community Character  The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.  (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3)  If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3.	January 20	·	TES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.	E3e, E3f, E3g		
b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire)	C4		
c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing.	C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a		О
d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources.	C2, E3		
e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character.	C2, C3		
f. Proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.	C2, C3 E1a, E1b E2g, E2h		П
g. Other impacts:		П	